

## REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, claims 4-11, 13-14, 16-17, 22-27, and 30-31 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry of the amended claims are respectfully requested.

Claims 4-31 are pending and under consideration.

### ITEMS 9-10: ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

Claims 18-21 are indicated as allowed. (Action at page 8). Applicant appreciates the indication of allowable subject matter.

### ITEM 2: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 6 AND 23 UNDER 35 USC §112, second paragraph

The Examiner rejects claims 6 and 23 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite. Regarding claim 6, the Examiner contends:

it is unclear . . . how/why a reset signal is output from the card to the reader. The Examiner notes that it is well known and conventional for a reader to reset the card, but it is unclear how/why claim 6 recites the card outputting a reset signal from the smart card. For purposes of Examination the Examiner will interpret the claim as the controller outputting a reset signal, as is conventional in the art.

Claim 6 is amended herein to address the Examiner's concern and recite that "the smart card controller provides clock signals to the smart card via a connection terminal, and the smart card controller resets signals sent to, and signals output from, the smart card via a reset terminal." Applicant also points out to the Examiner that as discussed in the specification paragraph [0030] (and illustrated in FIG. 1):

smart card controller 121 provides a clock signal to the smart card via the connection terminal SM\_CLK, i.e. a clock terminal, of the smart card connector on the interface 100, and resets an input/output operation of a signal to/from the smart card using the connection terminal SM\_RST, i.e. a reset terminal.

Regarding claim 23, the Examiner contends:

the claim to mean reading the information, registering the stored information, where registering includes storing the information.

Claim 23 is amended herein to address the Examiner's concern and recite "reading information from the smart card; and registering the information." As discussed, for example, in paragraph [0010]:

(a)ccording to another aspect of the present invention, the controller registers personal identification information stored in the smart card and deletes the registered personal identification information.

### Summary

Applicant submits that claims 6 and 23, as amended herein, comply with 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph and withdrawal of the rejection is requested.

**ITEM 3, PAGES 3-4: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 4-6 AND 24-25 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY WANG (U.S.P. 6,128,744)**

**ITEM 3, PAGES 5-6: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 7-9 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER WANG IN VIEW OF HUANG ET AL. (2003/0126483)**

Independent claims 4 and 24 (and respective dependent claims 5-6 and 25) are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Wang. Dependent claims 7-9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Huang. The rejections are traversed.

Applicant submits that Wang does not support an anticipatory-type rejection by not discussing features recited in the independent claims as a whole. As set forth in MPEP §706.02 entitled Rejection on Prior Art, anticipation requires that the reference must discuss every aspect of a claimed invention.

Applicant further submits that *prima facie* obviousness is not established since as set forth in MPEP §2143.03 "To establish *prima facie* obviousness of a claimed invention, all the claim limitations must be taught or suggested by the prior art."

Independent claim 4, as amended herein recites "a computer monitor capable of showing a display, comprising: an interface communicating with a smart card containing personal identification information; a detector detecting a signal through the interface determining insertion of the smart card into the computer monitor; and a controller reading the personal identification information via the interface from the smart card, and controlling turning a display of the computer monitor on or off, when the insertion of the smart card is detected."

Independent claim 24, as amended herein, recites a security apparatus including "a computer monitor capable of showing an on-screen display on a screen of the computer monitor, the computer monitor comprising a microcomputer receiving an insertion signal from the detector circuit."

Wang and Huang merely discuss starters and a starting method. Wang and Huang do not discuss a smart card inserted into a computer monitor capable of showing a display on a screen of the computer monitor and do not discuss a computer monitor capable of showing a display on a screen of the computer monitor receiving an insertion signal from the detector circuit.

The Examiner interprets "a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system)."

However, Applicant submits that the Examiner's interpretation does not apply to the present invention, as recited. Rather, according to aspects of the present invention it is the

computer monitor, itself, which is capable of showing a display on a screen of the computer monitor, into which a smart card is inserted.

**Summary**

Since features recited by independent claims 4 and 24 (and respective dependent claims 5-9 and 25) claims are not discussed by Wang, alone or in combination, with Huang, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 4-9 and 24-25 allowed.

**ITEM 3, PAGE 4: REJECTION OF CLAIM 16 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §102(b) AS BEING ANTICIPATED BY HUANG**

**ITEM 6: REJECTION OF CLAIM 17 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER HUANG**

Claim 16 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Huang, and dependent claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Huang. The rejections are traversed.

Applicant submits that Huang does not support an anticipatory-type rejection or an obviousness rejection by not discussing or suggesting features recited in the claims, as a whole.

Independent claim 16, as amended herein, recites a method of "checking the insertion of the smart card into the computer monitor through a smart card interface on the computer monitor; and turning the display of the computer monitor on when the insertion of the smart card is detected and information stored in the smart card is the same as information stored in the storage unit."

Huang merely teaches a computer starter. While the Examiner interprets "a computer starter as a display monitor," Huang does not discuss a computer monitor having a display into which a smart card is inserted.

In support of the rejection of dependent claim 17, the Examiner states "it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to delete information in order to update user records/performance maintained, as is conventional in the art." Applicant respectfully submits that this statement is not adequately supported by a reference.

**Summary**

Since features recited by claims 16-17 are not discussed by Huang, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 16-17 allowed.

**ITEM 3, PAGE 6: REJECTION OF CLAIM 22 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER WANG IN VIEW OF HUANG**

Claim 22 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Huang. The rejection is traversed.

Claim 22, as amended herein, recites a method of managing information, comprising:  
"detecting insertion of a smart card in a circuit, the circuit being part of a computer monitor that is capable of showing an on-screen display on a screen of the computer monitor supplying power to the detected smart card through the circuit reading information from the smart card;  
comparing the read information with information stored in a storage unit; and deleting the information in the storage unit if the information is substantially the same as the read information."

The art relied on by the Examiner does not discuss "detecting insertion of a smart card in a circuit, the circuit being part of a computer monitor that is capable of showing an on-screen display on a screen of the computer."

In addition, the Action concedes that Wang is silent to registering/storing the card information. However, the Examiner contends that

that data register 23 is used to store the computer secure check data (which is the system records for users) and can also store the user secure check data (from the card). Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art not to permanently record (to delete) the user secure check data after authentication.

In support of the rejection, the Examiner states :

(t)he Examiner believes that it would have been obvious not to record the card data permanently (to delete it) because it would constitute redundant data (duplicate of what is already stored, namely the computer secure check data). . . . it would have been obvious to store the data temporarily for electronic comparison, and that after a authentication is complete, deletion would have been obvious to delete such data so that memory space can be provided for the user secure check data (system records) and not duplicate data of attempts, thus ensuring adequate memory space. The storing of such duplicate data would not serve a purpose and would only consume memory space, and the electronic storage of data for comparisons are well known and conventional in the art.

The Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's statement and demands the Examiner produce authority for the statement, since the limitation is not of notorious character or capable of instant and unquestionable demonstration as being well-known. Instead, this limitation is unique to the present invention. See M.P.E.P. § 2144.03(A) ("the notice of facts beyond the record which may be taken by the Examiner must be "capable of such instant and unquestionable demonstration as to defy dispute").

Applicant submits that there is no evidence supporting the Examiner's assertion. It also appears that the Examiner also bases the rejection, at least in part, on personal knowledge. The Examiner is required under 37 C.F.R. § 1.104(d)(2) to support such an assertion with an affidavit when called for by the Applicant. Thus, Applicant calls upon the Examiner to support such assertion with an affidavit.

## Summary

Since features recited by claim 22 are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner and the Examiner's statements are not properly supported, the rejection should be withdrawn and claim 22 allowed.

### **ITEMS 4-5: REJECTION OF CLAIMS 10-15 AND 26-31 UNDER 35 U.S.C. §103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER WANG IN VIEW OF COMBINATIONS OF BILICH ET AL. (US 5,877,483) AND HUANG**

Claims 10-12, 26, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Bilich. Claims 13-15 and 27-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Wang in view of Bilich and Huang. The rejections are traversed.

Independent claims 11 and 26, both as amended herein, respectively recite a method, and a medium, using claim 11 as an example, "checking an insertion of a smart card into the computer monitor; turning the a display of the computer monitor off when the smart card is not inserted into the computer monitor, after a predetermined time; reading personal identification information from the smart card when the smart card is inserted into the computer monitor; turning the display shown on the computer monitor on if the personal identification information correlates to an authenticated user; and turning the display shown on the computer monitor off if the personal identification information does not correlate to the authenticated user."

Independent claim 30, as amended herein, recites a computer-readable medium encoded with processing instructions implementing a method "registering information stored in a smart card to a storage unit of the computer monitor; checking the insertion of the smart card into the computer monitor through a smart card interface in the computer monitor; and turning the display of the computer monitor on when the insertion of the smart card is detected and information stored in the smart card is substantially the same as information stored in the storage unit." Claim 31 dependent on claim 30.

Dependent claim 10 recites a computer monitor "wherein the controller turns the display of the computer monitor off when the detector does not recognize the presence of the smart card, after a predetermined time."

Neither Wang, alone or in combination with Bilich discuss checking an insertion of a smart card into a computer monitor. Wang merely discusses a starter.

The Examiner interprets "a computer starter as a display monitor as it controls the powering/operation of the display monitor connected to a system (computer system)." (Action at page 6). However, Applicant submits that the Examiner's interpretation does not apply to the present invention, as recited. Rather, according to aspects of the present invention it is the

computer monitor, itself, into which a smart card is inserted.

In addition, in support of the rejection, the Examiner contends:

Bilich et al. teaches that the sequence involves a user logging off, but the Examiner notes that it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art for the system to automatically log off and shut down/power down when a card is removed, in order to provide additional security (no access is given with no card present) or additional convenience to the user (not having to manually log out).

Applicant submits that it appears that by this statement, the Examiner also bases the rejection, at least in part, on personal knowledge. The Examiner is required under 37 C.F.R. §1.104(d)(2) to support such an assertion with an affidavit when called for by the Applicant. Thus, Applicant calls upon the Examiner to support such assertion with an affidavit.

#### Summary

Since features recited by claims 10-15 and 26-31 are not discussed by the art relied on by the Examiner, the rejection should be withdrawn and claims 10-15 and 26-31 allowed.

#### CONCLUSION

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: Aug 19, 2008

By: Paul W. Bobowiec  
Paul W. Bobowiec  
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, NW, 7th Floor  
Washington, D.C. 20005  
Telephone: (202) 434-1500  
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501